

---

## Nolichucky Reservoir Flood Remediation Environmental Impact Statement

(X) Draft

( ) Final

**Lead Agency:** Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA)

**Abstract:** TVA has prepared this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to identify and evaluate a range of ways to address flooding effects of Nolichucky Dam and the accumulated sediment in Nolichucky Reservoir on land and property not owned by the federal government. Nolichucky Dam was built in 1913 as a single-purpose power production facility and was acquired by TVA in 1945. All four electric generators were removed from service between 1965 and 1972 because of sediment-related problems. Since 1972, the project has been used for wildlife management and environmental education. The federal government owns approximately 1,400 acres of land under and around the reservoir and holds easements over approximately 370 acres of land along this part of the river. These land rights include approximately 54 percent of the area within the present 500-year floodplain. Most of the remaining approximately 1,125 acres in the 500-year floodplain is in private ownership. Recent studies indicate that silt accumulations in the reservoir have raised the 100-year flood level by as much as 10 feet above what it probably was in 1945 and, even then, the project landrights did not include all of the area that would have been affected during flood events. Four alternatives are discussed in detail in this EIS. Alternative A (No Action) would not change the potential for homes, historic structures, and other property in the area to be subject to flooding. Alternative B would involve the acquisition of fee title or flood easements over approximately 1,000 acres of private land within the present 500-year flood elevation upstream from Nolichucky Dam. Alternative C would involve lowering the height of the spillway in Nolichucky Dam and removing some sediment from the reservoir pool. Alternative D would involve removing all visible components of the dam and more sediment from the river valley. The potential environmental effects of Alternatives A and B are described in this EIS, along with general evaluations of the potential effects associated with Alternatives C and D. If either Alternative C or D was adopted, the site-specific details of the project and its site-specific environmental effects would be addressed in a supplement to this EIS. At this time, TVA has not selected a preferred alternative way to address the flooding effects caused by Nolichucky Dam and Reservoir on non-federal land and property. TVA encourages members of the public and representatives from interested agencies to study the content of this draft EIS and to comment on the analysis it contains.

**For further information, contact:**

Susan Fuhr, Manager  
TVA Cherokee/Douglas Watershed Team  
2611 West Andrew Johnson Highway  
Morristown, Tennessee 37814  
423/587-5600

**Send comments to:**

**E-mail:** nol-eiscomments@tva.gov  
**Surface mail:**  
John Jenkinson  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
P.O. Box 1589  
Norris, Tennessee 37828

**The deadline for comments on this draft EIS is March 29, 2002.**

---

---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) has prepared this draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in accordance with Council of Environmental Quality regulations and TVA procedures for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of this EIS is to identify and evaluate a range of ways to address flooding effects of Nolichucky Dam and the accumulated sediment in Nolichucky Reservoir on land and property not owned by the federal government.

The Nolichucky River watershed includes parts of Avery, Mitchell, and Yancey counties in western North Carolina; and parts of Cocke, Greene, Hamblen, Jefferson, Unicoi, and Washington counties in eastern Tennessee. Nolichucky Dam is located at Nolichucky River Mile 46, about 7.5 miles south of Greeneville, in Greene County, Tennessee. Nolichucky Reservoir, also known as Davy Crockett Lake, extends upstream about six miles from the dam. Nolichucky Dam was built by the Tennessee Eastern Electric Company in 1913 as a single-purpose power production facility and was acquired by TVA in 1945. All four electric generators were removed from service between 1965 and 1972 because of sediment-related problems. Since 1972, the project has been used for wildlife management and environmental education.

A review of the present federal land rights around Nolichucky Reservoir indicates that the federal government owns approximately 1,400 acres of land under and around Nolichucky Reservoir and holds easements over approximately 370 acres of land along this part of the river. These land rights include approximately 54 percent of the area within the present 500-year floodplain and approximately 63 percent of the area within the 100-year floodplain. Most of the remaining approximately 1,125 acres in the 500-year floodplain is in private ownership (41 percent of this area). Approximately 64 privately-owned structures occur within this 500-year floodplain, 19 of which might be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

In 1998, partly in response to letters and questions from local property owners, TVA began reviewing the areas around Nolichucky Reservoir that would be affected during flood events. Staff analysis indicated that the

present 100-year floodplain includes approximately 2,000 acres and the larger area within the 500-year floodplain includes approximately 2,450 acres. Recent silt accumulations in the reservoir have raised the 100-year flood level by as much as 10 feet above what it probably was when TVA acquired the project in 1945. Even in 1945, the project landrights did not include all of the area which would have been affected by Nolichucky Dam during flood events.

### **Alternatives**

Suggestions about possible ways to address the flooding effects on non-federal land were made by the public, various agencies, and TVA staff during the scoping process for this project. The four alternatives that developed during this evaluation process and are discussed in detail in this EIS were: A -- No Action, B -- acquire the affected land or land rights, C -- lower the spillway in the dam and, D -- remove Nolichucky Dam.

Under **Alternative A (No Action)**, TVA would not take any action to address the potential flood impacts on non-federal lands that could occur because of the presence of Nolichucky Dam and the sediment accumulation in Nolichucky Reservoir. TVA would not acquire any additional land rights, take any action to remove sediment from the reservoir, or reduce the potential for flooding in any way. Information about the boundaries of various projected flood levels would be provided to appropriate agencies in Greeneville, Greene County, and to landowners in the affected areas. TVA would assist agencies and individuals in understanding the potential flooding effects around the reservoir but would not attempt to influence what individual owners would do on their land. Greene County probably would require compliance with applicable local floodplain regulations during any future development of the land around the reservoir. Nolichucky Dam and Powerhouse would continue to be maintained as required by federal Dam Safety regulations and to preserve their historic value.

If Alternative A was adopted, present environmental conditions and ongoing trends would continue both in the water and on the land surrounding the reservoir. Present flood elevations upstream from Nolichucky Dam would not be affected by this alternative and approximately 1,000 acres of land not in federal ownership or covered by flood easements would continue to be

located within the 500-year floodplain affected by the dam. Approximately 64 privately-owned structures occur within this 500-year floodplain, 19 of which might be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. This alternative would not have any effect on the present population or economic conditions in the area adjacent to Nolichucky Reservoir.

Under **Alternative B (Acquire Land Rights)**, TVA would address the potential flooding effects on non-federal land by acquiring either fee title or easements with the right to flood all of the non-federal land within the present 500-year flood boundary around Nolichucky Reservoir (about 1,000 acres). TVA would decide whether to acquire fee title or a flood easement on any given tract based on a tract-specific evaluation of the potential flooding effects. Fee simple acquisition would mean that TVA would buy the affected land, all structures built on it, and would hold all rights concerning the use of that land. If TVA acquired only a flood easement, TVA would buy the right to overflow and flood specific parts of the property on an intermittent and temporary basis. The owner could continue to use the easement land in many ways, but would relinquish the right to build structures below a specific elevation on the affected property and would have to receive TVA approval prior to developing the affected land. Nolichucky Dam and Powerhouse would continue to be maintained as required by federal Dam Safety regulations and to preserve their historic value.

If Alternative B was adopted, present flood elevations upstream from Nolichucky Dam would not be affected but the federal government would own either fee title or flood easements over all of the land within the 500-year floodplain upstream from the dam. Most of the new land acquired in fee probably would be added to the existing wildlife management area, presently managed by the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency. Uses of the land within this floodplain area would be controlled to minimize the potential for flooding effects, and all structures on this land, including potentially eligible historic structures, probably would be floodproofed, relocated to higher ground, or removed. Environmental conditions and ongoing trends in the water and on the land surrounding the reservoir would not be adversely affected. In fact, public ownership or control over the entire floodplain area could lead to improved terrestrial habitat conditions, more resource

protection, and increased recreation potential. If increased recreation use did occur, this alternative could result in modest positive effects on economic conditions in the area surrounding Nolichucky Reservoir.

Under **Alternative C (Lower Nolichucky Dam)**, TVA would address the potential flooding effects on non-federal land and property by lowering the spillway part of Nolichucky Dam after removing or stabilizing sediment in the reservoir. The intent of this alternative would be to lower the spillway by approximately 40 feet (to elevation 1200) so that the 500-year flood elevation associated with the modified dam would only affect land already in federal ownership or covered by existing flood easements. A general evaluation of the environmental effects associated with the types of activities that would be included this alternative is included in this EIS; however, the site-specific details of the project would be determined as part of the pre-construction design process. If this alternative was adopted, the site-specific environmental effects evaluation would be added in a supplement to the final EIS.

If Alternative C was adopted, lowering the spillway and removing sediment from the reservoir would reduce flood elevations to the point that the 500-year floodplain associated with Nolichucky Dam would not affect private land and property; however, some presently buried archaeological and historic sites might be exposed as sediment was relocated out of the reservoir pool. All federal land around the reservoir would remain in public ownership and would continue to be used for wildlife management, environmental education, and public parks, while private land no longer in flood-prone areas would be available for other uses.

Lowering the reservoir pool by 40 feet would lower the groundwater level adjacent to the reservoir, in some places enough that nearby well performance could be adversely affected. Lowering the pool level also would drain approximately 310 acres of high quality wetlands around and in the reservoir, which would adversely modify the habitats of a variety of terrestrial plants and animals that typically occur only in wetlands. Lowering the spillway and disturbing the sediment in Nolichucky Reservoir could result in some increased sedimentation in the river downstream from Nolichucky Dam

during the construction period; however, the inclusion of sediment control measures and monitoring requirements would result in only insignificant effects on downstream aquatic life. Adoption of this alternative might still result in significant adverse construction effects on one or more silt-intolerant protected aquatic species living only where the dam presently protects them from excessive sedimentation. Recreation and resource management opportunities in the area would be different from present uses around the reservoir and probably would shift to focus more on river-related activities. The local economy would receive a short-term benefit from the construction activities included in this alternative and a possible minor long-term benefit if recreation use did increase in the area.

Under **Alternative D (Remove Nolichucky Dam)**, TVA would address the flooding effects of Nolichucky Dam and reservoir on the adjacent non-federal lands using the same general approach as Alternative C -- lowering the 500-year flood elevation by lowering the dam and removing or stabilizing the accumulated sediment. Under this alternative, however, TVA would completely remove all visible components of Nolichucky Dam and powerhouse from the river valley. The general types and sequence of activities included in this alternative would be the same as those described under Alternative C; however, some specific differences would occur associated with removing the remainder of the dam, the powerhouse, and more of the accumulated sediment. If this alternative was adopted, site-specific details of the project would be determined as part of the pre-construction design process and the site-specific environmental effects would be added in a supplement to the general evaluation presented in this EIS.

Adoption of Alternative D would result in the removal of all visible components of Nolichucky Dam from the valley and the restoration of a free-flowing river through this area. The resulting 500-year flood elevation would be well within the existing federal landrights in the area. All federal land around the reservoir would remain in public ownership and would continue to be used for wildlife management, environmental education, and public parks. Some presently buried archaeological and historic sites might be exposed as sediment was relocated out of the full length of the reservoir pool.

Lowering the reservoir pool by 70 feet would lower the groundwater level adjacent to the reservoir, in places enough that nearby well performance could be adversely affected. Approximately 310 acres of wetlands upstream from the dam would be drained, which would adversely modify the habitats of a variety of terrestrial plants and animals typically found only in wetlands. The land disturbance activities associated with this project would include sedimentation control measures and monitoring requirements which would result in insignificant effects on surface water quality, sedimentation, and aquatic life in the Nolichucky River during the construction period. Following the complete removal of the dam, however, the river bed downstream from the dam site would be blanketed with sand and other coarse sediment, which would have immediate and significant adverse effects on some aquatic species. Freshwater mussels and other uncommon bottom-dwelling species; including two listed federal endangered species, might be eliminated from the river. Once the dam was removed, recreation activities in the former reservoir area could expand to include tubing, float fishing, and possibly as good or better canoeing potential as exists in the first 10 miles upstream or downstream from the reservoir. The net impact of this alternative on the local economy and employment probably would be positive, especially over the long term.

### **Comparison**

The adoption of Alternative A or B would result in very similar effects on the environment; however, Alternative B would address the potential flooding effects on non-federal land and property while Alternative A would not. Alternative B would involve the acquisition of fee title or flood easement rights over approximately 1,000 acres of private land within the present 500-year flood elevation upstream from Nolichucky Dam. Alternative A would not affect the ownership of this land; however, homes, historic structures, and other property located on that land would continue to be subject to flooding.

The adoption of Alternative C or D also would result in similar environmental effects; however, those effects would be very different from what would occur under Alternative A or B. Both C and D would involve modifications to the dam that would reduce the flood elevations around the reservoir and avoid the project-related flooding effects on private land and property, including

homes and historic structures. Results of this general evaluation indicate that both of these projects also could drain about 310 acres of significant wetlands, lower groundwater levels in wells close to the reservoir, expose some buried archaeological or historic sites, and cause adverse effects on aquatic life in the river downstream from Nolichucky Dam. Largely because it would involve the complete removal of Nolichucky Dam, Alternative D would likely result in more extensive adverse effects on the downstream part of the river and aquatic life than Alternative C. Once the dam was removed, Alternative D would result in significant changes in the downstream river substrate, which could eliminate some types of bottom-dwelling animals, including two federal endangered mussel species. Alternative D also would reconnect the upstream and downstream parts of the river and refocus local recreation activities on the free-flowing river. Both of these alternatives would include a variety of ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the potential adverse effects; however, some of those effects (such as the loss of the wetlands and elimination of endangered aquatic species) would be extremely difficult to mitigate completely.

The estimated costs and completion times associated with these alternatives are as follows:

<u>Alternative</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Duration</u>
A	minimal	3 months
B	\$15 - \$20 Million	3 years
C	\$45 - \$70 Million	5 - 10 years
D	\$90 - \$150 Million	10 - 12 years

The construction activities associated with both Alternatives C and D would provide some short-term economic benefit to the local area. All of the action alternatives (Alternatives B, C, and D) might result in some long-term economic benefits; however, the extent of those potential benefits would depend on decisions that would be made by many individuals and governmental agencies.

At this time, TVA has not selected a preferred alternative way to address the flooding effects caused by Nolichucky Dam and Reservoir on non-federal land and property. TVA encourages members of the public and



representatives from interested agencies to study the content of this draft EIS and to comment on the analysis it contains. Those comments will help determine the scope and content of any revisions to be made in the final EIS and the identification of a preferred alternative.

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Executive Summary	i
List of Tables	ix
List of Figures	xiv
 <b>CHAPTER 1 - PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION</b>	
1.1 Purpose	1
1.2 Background	1
1.3 Decision to be Made	8
1.4 Scoping Process	8
1.5 Issues to be Addressed in Detail	9
1.6 Study Area	10
1.7 Related Documents	11
1.8 Review and Consultation Requirements	11
1.9 EIS Overview	15
 <b>CHAPTER 2 - ALTERNATIVES</b>	
2.1 Introduction	17
2.2 Selection of Alternatives	17
2.3 Floodplains and Land Rights	19
2.4 Alternative A - No Action	23
2.5 Alternative B - Acquire Land Rights	24
2.6 Alternative C - Lower Nolichucky Dam	25
2.7 Alternative D - Remove Nolichucky Dam	31
2.8 Alternatives Not Evaluated in Detail	33
2.9 Comparison of Alternatives	35
2.10 Preferred Alternative	43
 <b>CHAPTER 3 - AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT</b>	
3.1 Introduction	45
3.2 Climate, Geology, and Soils	45
3.3 Ground Water	51

<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
3.4 Surface Water and Sedimentation	55
3.5 Aquatic Life	73
3.6 Wetlands	83
3.7 Floodplains and Flood Risk	92
3.8 Terrestrial Life	95
3.9 Endangered and Threatened Species	99
3.10 Land Use	109
3.11 Visual Character, Recreation, and Managed Areas	114
3.12 Cultural Resources	119
3.13 Socioeconomics	123
3.14 Environmental Justice	127

#### **CHAPTER 4 - ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES**

4.1 Introduction	129
4.2 Climate, Geology, and Soils	129
4.3 Ground Water	132
4.4 Surface Water and Sedimentation	135
4.5 Aquatic Life	146
4.6 Wetlands	155
4.7 Floodplains and Flood Risk	160
4.8 Terrestrial Life	163
4.9 Endangered and Threatened Species	167
4.10 Land Use	175
4.11 Visual Character, Recreation, and Managed Areas	178
4.12 Cultural Resources	184
4.13 Socioeconomics	188
4.14 Environmental Justice	192
4.15 Cumulative Impacts	192
4.16 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	193
4.17 Short-term Uses and Long-term Productivity	194
4.18 Irreversible and Irretrievable Resource Commitments	194

---

**Section****Page****CHAPTER 5 - SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

5.1	List of Preparers	195
5.2	Glossary of Terms	201
5.3	References	205
5.4	Index	213

**APPENDICES**

A.	Land Ownership Around Nolichucky Reservoir	A-1
B.	A Survey of Fish, Mussels, and Other Benthic Invertebrates in Parts of the Nolichucky River in East Tennessee	B-1
C.	Lists of wetland plants and terrestrial animals observed around Nolichucky Reservoir during field studies conducted in 2000.	C-1
D.	Names, habitat preferences, and occurrence information for the protected species which could occur in the counties around Nolichucky Reservoir.	D-1
E.	Estimated flood elevations upstream from Nolichucky Dam under each of the four alternatives.	E-1

## LIST OF TABLES

1.	Condensed list of suggested ways to reduce flooding effects on non-federal land and property around Nolichucky Reservoir.	18
2.	Federal land ownership rights associated with Nolichucky Reservoir and all ownership rights within the 500-year and 100-year floodplains around the reservoir.	22
3.	Summary comparison of the four alternatives being evaluated in detail.	36
4.	Summary of the potential environmental effects of the four alternatives being evaluated in detail.	37-38
5.	Climate statistics representing the Nolichucky Reservoir area.	47
6.	Climate statistics representing the upper Nolichucky River watershed.	48
7	Prime farmland soils within the areas of 500-Year and 100-Year floodplains upstream from Nolichucky Dam.	52
8.	Typical characteristics of groundwater in the Blue Ridge and Ridge and Valley parts of the Nolichucky River system.	55
9.	Stream segments in the Tennessee part of the Nolichucky River watershed that did not fully support their designated uses when evaluated in 1998.	59
10.	Results of grain size analysis of representative core samples from sediments in Nolichucky Reservoir.	70
11.	Chemical analyses results from segments of sediment core samples collected at various sites in Nolichucky Reservoir during 2000.	72
12.	Summary of the numbers of species (and other identified taxa) encountered during benthic invertebrate sampling at five sites on the Nolichucky River during 2000.	74

---

13.	Summary of the numbers of species (and other identified taxa) encountered during benthic invertebrate sampling at sites on the Nolichucky River in earlier years.	75
14.	Summary of the results from the native mussel survey conducted on the Nolichucky River during 2000.	78
15.	Summary of the results from the native mussel survey conducted on the Nolichucky River during 1980.	79
16.	Summary of the results of the fish survey conducted at five sites on the Nolichucky River during 2000.	81
17.	Summary of the results from the fish survey at 31 sites on the Nolichucky River conducted by Tennessee Wildlife Resource Agency staff during 1998.	82
18.	Summary results from earlier fish evaluations on the Nolichucky River.	82
19.	Wetlands identified during interpretation of aerial photography of the floodplain areas around Nolichucky Reservoir.	86
20.	Summary of the numbers of federal and Tennessee endangered, threatened, and other categories of protected species known from the three counties included in this evaluation.	99
21.	Endangered, threatened, and special concern plant species known from the area within the Nolichucky River watershed which could be affected by one or more of the action alternatives.	100
22.	Endangered, threatened, and special concern animal species known from the area within the Nolichucky River watershed which could be affected by one or more of the alternatives.	102
23.	Land use and land cover in the Nolichucky River watershed.	110
24.	Land use/land cover categories identified during interpretation of aerial photography of the floodplain areas around Nolichucky Reservoir.	112

25.	Types of buildings located in the floodplain areas around Nolichucky Reservoir.	113
26.	Population statistics for counties in the labor market area surrounding Greene County, Tennessee.	124
27.	Average 2000 labor force and unemployment statistics in counties in the labor market area surrounding Greene County, Tennessee.	125
28.	Full- and part-time employment by industry in counties in the labor market area surrounding Greene County, Tennessee.	126
29.	Per capita personal income in the labor market area surrounding Greene County, Tennessee.	126
30.	Minority and low-income population for counties in the labor market area surrounding Greene County, Tennessee.	128

---

## LIST OF FIGURES

1.	Nolichucky River watershed in Tennessee and North Carolina.	2
2.	The area around Nolichucky Reservoir.	3
3.	Comparison of the present 100-year flood profile and the estimated 1945 100-year flood profile along part of the length of the Nolichucky River.	7
4.	Possible floodplain boundaries around a lowered Nolichucky Reservoir with a spillway at elevation 1200 feet.	29
5.	Suspended sediment concentrations as a function of stream discharge at two sites upstream from Nolichucky Reservoir.	63
6.	Comparison of suspended sediment concentrations upstream and downstream from Nolichucky Dam during three time intervals between the 1930s and the 1990s.	64
7.	Volume of accumulated sediment in Nolichucky Reservoir, calculated from TVA transect surveys.	68
8.	Broad categories of land uses within the 500-year floodplain around Nolichucky Reservoir.	87

[ The map showing land ownership around Nolichucky Reservoir is presented in Appendix A, the first section following the EIS text. ]